



International Labour Organization

**IPEC**

International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour

## ***IPEC Evaluation***

---

**Assessing the Situation of  
Children in the Production, Sales  
and Trafficking of Drugs in  
Indonesia, the Philippines and  
Thailand**

**RAS/02/P52/USA  
P.270.03.300.052**

---

**A Final Project Evaluation**

**by**

**An Independent Evaluation Team**

**December 2004**

## **Contents**

<i>Acronyms</i>	3
<i>Executive Summary</i>	4
<b>A: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>A1: Project context and justification</i>	6
<i>A2: The project</i>	7
<i>A3: Scope and purpose of this evaluation</i>	8
<i>A4: Methodology</i>	9
<b>B: EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>B1: Project design – logic, coherence, practicality</i>	12
<i>B2: Appropriateness of design</i>	15
<i>B3: Identifying beneficiaries, targeting interventions</i>	17
<i>B4: Problems and needs of beneficiaries</i>	19
<i>B5: Achievement of intended outputs</i>	21
<i>B6: Has the project achieved its objectives?</i>	22
<i>B7: Indicators – validity, achievement</i>	23
<i>B8: Implementation and effectiveness</i>	24
<i>B9: Project relevance</i>	26
<i>B10: Local management structures and their participation in implementation</i>	27
<i>B11: Effectiveness and value for money</i>	28
<i>B12: Changes in external factors; monitoring and change to project plans</i>	29
<i>B13: Opportunities for participation</i>	29
<i>B14: Validity of the project approach and strategies, and potential to replicate</i>	30
<i>B15: Sustainability</i>	31
<b>C: LESSONS AND CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>33</b>
<i>C1: General lessons</i>	33
<i>C2: Conclusions/Recommendations for IPEC (&amp; donor/development partners)</i>	34
<i>C3: More specific lessons and recommendations for the Philippines</i>	37
<i>C4: More specific lessons and recommendations for Indonesia</i>	38
<i>C5: More specific lessons and recommendations for Thailand</i>	39

## **Acronyms**

ARTI -	Action Research and Training Institute
CBO -	community-based organization
CBS -	Central Bureau of Statistics
CDT -	child drug traffickers
CRC -	Convention on the Rights of the Child
DDB -	Dangerous Drugs Board
FCED -	Families and Children for Empowerment and Development
GNP -	gross national product
HIV -	human immunodeficiency virus
HPDN -	Highland People's Development Network
KKPC -	Kapatiran Komunitas People's Coalition
IEC -	Information, Education and Communication
ILO -	International Labour Organization
IPEC -	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
MOE -	Ministry of Education
NCYD -	National Council for Child and Youth Development
NGO -	non-government organization
NNB -	National Narcotics Board
PAOR -	participatory action-oriented research
PECS -	precursors and essential chemicals
PNB -	Provincial Narcotics Board
PTA -	Parents-Teachers Association
RSH-	Sexual and Reproductive Health
SEKAM -	Yayasan Setia Kawan Mandiri
TBP -	Time Bound Programme
UNICEF -	United Nations Children's Fund
UNODC -	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
USAID -	United States Agency for International Development
VDRA -	Volunteer Drugs Resistance Education
WFCL -	worst forms of child labour
YKAI -	Yayasan Kesejahteraan Anak Indonesia
YPI -	Yayasan Pelita Ilmu

## **Executive Summary**

ILO-IPEC started executing this project in Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand in September 2002. The project aimed to develop and demonstrate an action-oriented research methodology that provides better understanding and information on the use of children in the production, sales, and distribution of illegal drugs. In the course of conducting the research, the project also aimed to reach children at risk as well as those involved in drugs through community organizing/mobilization, training, advocacy, counselling, referrals, and networking/linkages. At the end of the project, it also aimed to propose models of interventions for future replication or adaptation in other areas.

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess whether the objectives of the action research were attained, particularly in increasing the knowledge base on children in drug trafficking and in identifying/documenting effective models of intervention. The evaluation aims to give recommendations and lessons learned for incorporation into future planning or modification of activities or strategies, for TBP countries in particular.

The evaluation found that project outputs were fairly successfully delivered, demonstrating that it is possible to work in this difficult sector. But the immediate objective – to enhance knowledge of key stakeholders including government – was only partially completed and may have been too ambitious for such a short project. Engagement with key stakeholders was in most cases limited at the provincial, national, and sub-regional levels, although community level participation was a strong feature of the outputs.

Research findings are valuable, giving a picture of a highly complex problem. CDT as a sector is geographically dispersed, and child drug users can rarely be easily separated from drug traffickers. This, and the links between drug problems and a range of other issues, means that a holistic understanding is required in order to engage effectively.

Prevention work in this sector makes more sense than ‘withdrawal’ of children from WFCL for a host of reasons related largely to the difficulty of working in an illegal field. It is hard and often counterproductive to divide child traffickers from child users. In general, attempts to reach specific numbers of children were usefully balanced by partner organisations’ own wider mandates and interests; a focus on root causes as well as on prevention is recommended for future work.

The project has developed partnerships and documented lessons that can be built upon and added to in order to engage with policy. Research in itself is unlikely to have policy impact unless it is part of a broader process designed to engage others, especially at a higher level, and focuses on advocacy or change objectives. More broadly, the project showed some of the shortcomings of government policy and practice on drugs, which in all pilot countries prioritises tackling crime over solving social problems. In doing so can exacerbate problems faced by children.

Different intervention models that have been developed give ideas about how to engage. No one model emerges as preferable – it depends on the situation and available experience in any one location, and all models should be adapted to local circumstances if employed in future. School-based approaches offer valuable opportunities to go to scale, if accompanied by policy engagement, but may miss out those children who have already left the school system.

It is hard to engage appropriately on a national basis within a regional programme, and the project has done reasonably in this regard. It is recommended that future efforts take place on a national basis, and begin with a long, participatory design phase in order to build local ownership and define appropriate project management structures, plans and outputs.

Experience of working with intermediary organisations in delivering programmes is generally positive, and it is a strategy that can be employed more widely. But, relations with key partners were affected by financial management and administrative constraints that IPEC could try to tackle in future work.

In summary, the evaluation finds sufficient evidence of progress, cost-effectiveness and relevance to justify continued engagement in this sector. Longer-term, more nationally owned approaches will be required, with more emphasis on engaging other bodies over time. IPEC alone will not solve the problems encountered in this field, but by working with domestic partners it can contribute to common efforts and improved policy.

## A: INTRODUCTION

### A1: Project context and justification

This evaluation gives a brief background. More detail can be found in project reports.<sup>1</sup>

Since the 1990s, the use, sale, and production of illegal drugs have become a major issue in the region. In Jakarta, Indonesia, about 70 locations in the city had been pinpointed by the police as centres or “hot spots” for drug supply/trade. In the early 1990s, the Philippines was a major transshipment point for drugs but became a net producer and exporter by the late 1990s. Thailand, originally part of one of the world's major producing regions, is now more affected by trafficking and use.

Reports have found a significant number of children have been found to be engaged in illicit drug use, sale, and trafficking in the Asia-Pacific region particularly in Indonesia, Philippines and Thailand. ILO Convention 182 calls for ILO member countries to take steps to eliminate the worst forms of child labour as a matter of urgency. It considers the use of children in illicit activities, explicitly including the use of children in the production, sales, and trafficking of drugs, as one of the worst forms of child labour (WFCL). The engagement of children in drug-related activities is often linked to problems and tensions in their families, peer networks, and communities, as well as criminality and the medical or physical impact of drug use.

Children involved in drug sales and trafficking are difficult to trace and identify, as is often the case with other worst forms of child labour. Social and political sensitivity to the issue, the illegal and hidden nature of the trade, and the associated security risks and the potential difficulties in addressing the problem, make it necessary to use a cautious and process-based approach.

**Existing knowledge:** In 1999-2000, the ILO-IPEC regional office in Bangkok commissioned rapid assessments of children involved in the production, sale and trafficking of drugs in Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand. Of particular interest were findings concerning the high level of abuse and trafficking in different forms of metamphetamine (locally known as *shabu* in the Philippines and *shabu-shabu* in Indonesia, and *yaba* in Thailand), in addition to other substances. The rapid assessments also showed that these children came mainly from disadvantaged (socially, culturally, and economically) households with high levels of stress generated by poverty, family conflicts, separation/divorce, substance abuse, gambling and other vices.

Children/youth, being minors with their presumed innocence, are used by adult drug traffickers because the police usually do not suspect them, and they often avoid the adult justice system.

Given the recent emergence of this phenomenon, the project aimed to understand: (1) the characteristics of children/youth engaged in drug abuse, sale, and trafficking; (2) the pattern of recruitment into the drug network and the strategies/techniques employed in getting the children hooked into drugs/drug network; and (3) the strategies/techniques in preventing them from

---

<sup>1</sup> See especially “*Working Children in Drugs: A synthesis of participatory action-oriented research programs in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand*”, by Emma Porio and Christine Crisol, 2004.

joining and/or rehabilitating them from the drug network and become part of the mainstream institution of work, education, and social networks in their community and society.

## **A2: The project**

ILO-IPEC started executing this participatory action-oriented research (PAOR) project (hereinafter, the project) in Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand in September 2002.<sup>2</sup> The project aimed to develop and demonstrate an action-oriented research methodology that provides better understanding and information on the use of children in the production, sales, and distribution of illegal drugs. In the course of conducting the research, the project also aimed to reach children at risk as well as those involved in drugs through community organizing/mobilization, training, advocacy, counselling, referrals, and networking/linkages. At the end of the project, it also aimed to propose models of interventions for future replication or adaptation in other areas.

**Target beneficiaries.** The direct beneficiaries of the project were: (1) children and youth population (7-17 years of age)<sup>3</sup> at risk of engaging and/or engaged in drug sales and trafficking. The project aimed to **prevent** and remove children/youth who were at risk and/or were already involved in the use, sales and distribution of drugs in urban/rural poor communities in Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand. The participatory action research was implemented in collaboration with research institutions and partner GOs/NGOs/CBOs who provided direct interventions/services through family/child counselling and support, community awareness and training, youth mobilization and referral services. Through these activities, parents/guardians of the children, community officials and other leaders/members of other civil society groups were also reached and mobilized for anti-drug activities.

The project reached a total of 1,300 direct beneficiaries and over 1,500 indirect beneficiaries such as families/peer groups<sup>4</sup> of children, community leaders/residents, and personnel of implementing organizations and partners. In general, the project's implementing organizations/partners and collaborating NGOs/GOs/CBOs had some prior experience of child, child labour or anti-drug programs.

**Indirect beneficiaries.** School officials/administrators, teachers, social workers, community leaders/residents, and collaborating NGOs/GOs/CBOs were also involved in the activities of the project. Over 1,500 parents, children, youth, community leaders and residents were reached by information and education campaigns, advocacy sessions/training and support services provided by the partner GOs/NGOs/CBOs.

---

<sup>2</sup> The project was approved in late 2002 but actual implementation was delayed to mid-2003.

<sup>3</sup> A few beneficiaries, particularly in Jakarta, were 18-21 years old. They were included because they were linked to the younger children and to the drug network in the project site.

<sup>4</sup> In the Philippines and Thailand, children/youth were the direct beneficiaries, except in Indonesia where 300 parents were also receiving direct assistance/services.

	Project Site	Community Based	School Based	Street Based	Beneficiaries
Indonesia	Yayasan Kesejahteraan Anak Indonesia (YKAI), East Jakarta	*			Direct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>400 children at risk or already involved in drug sales/ trafficking/ production</li> <li>(200 street children; 200 community children)</li> <li>300 families of the community children</li> </ul> Indirect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community leaders</li> <li>Implementing partners' staff</li> </ul>
	Yayasan Pelita Ilmu (YPI), East Jakarta	*			
	Yayasan Setia Kawan Mandiri (SEKAM), East Jakarta			*	
	Action Research and Training Institute (ARTI), Research Organization				
Philippines	Addictus-Philippines, Barangay 91, Pasay City, Metro Manila	*			Direct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>260 community children at risk or already involved in drug sales/ trafficking/ production</li> <li>(100 children by Addictus-Philippines; 100 children by KKPC; 60 children by FCED)</li> <li>junior advocates</li> <li>community workers</li> <li>parent advocates</li> <li>core group members</li> </ul> Indirect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>87 barangay leaders</li> <li>1,500 parents, youth, children, community leaders and residents</li> <li>Implementing partners' staff</li> </ul>
	Families and Children for Empowerment and Development (FCED), Paco-Pandacan, City of Manila	*			
	Kapatiran Komuinidad People's Coalition (KKPC), Tatalon, Quezon City, Metro Manila	*			
	Ateneo de Manila University (ADMU) - Research Organization				
Thailand	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD), 10 schools in Bangkok		*		Direct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>340 children/youths (150 youths in schools; 100 community children/ youths; 30 children/ youths in Chiang Rai; 60 vulnerable children/ youths in Chiang Mai)</li> </ul> Indirect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other children and youths, parents, community members as well as other students and teachers in the schools</li> </ul>
	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD), Volunteer Drugs Resistance Association (VDRA), 4 communities in Bangkok	*			
	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD), Highland Peoples Development Network (HPDN), Schools, 2 communities in Chiang Mai and Chiang Rai	*	*		
	National Council for Child and Youth Development (NCYD) - Research Organization				

### A3: Scope and purpose of this evaluation

The scope of the evaluation includes all project activities to date. The evaluation looks at the project as a whole and addresses issues of project design, implementation, lessons learned, replicability and recommendations for future programmes including Time Bound Programmes in Indonesia and the Philippines.

The purpose of the present evaluation is to assess whether the objectives of the action research were attained, particularly in increasing the knowledge base on children in drug trafficking and in identifying/documenting effective models of intervention. The evaluation aims to give



recommendations and lessons learned for incorporation into future planning or modification of activities or strategies for TBP countries. The evaluation notes potential good practices that may be identified over the course of the exercise. The exercise also attempts to identify possible areas for future IPEC support and areas for future action by communities, implementing agencies and relevant authorities.

#### **A4: Methodology**

Several evaluation methods were employed. These were selected in order to fulfil the terms of reference, and to fit context, time limits, human resources, and extent of available information.

Evaluation findings combined methods ('triangulation') to draw conclusions, using both qualitative and quantitative evidence as appropriate. As far as possible, evidence and opinions were only used if verifiable from several sources. The methods are:

- Interviews with partners, staff, participants and other key informants;
- Workshops for stakeholders;
- General information: background reading; field visits; examination of project material including original document and indicators, reports, monitoring, evaluations, and documented findings or other outputs.

Full notes taken during interviews, field visits and workshops have been provided separately to the Design, Evaluation and Documentation section of IPEC. Material was sifted, checked and prioritised in order to produce a readable and relevant report, which is not included in this document or set of annexes, but which does provide DED with raw data as a basis of and justification for the findings contained in this report.

The evaluation took a broad overview of work in the three countries and at the sub-regional level. It tested relevance as well as outputs. The project includes many action programmes, and given a limited timeframe, efforts were concentrated on overall issues of relevance to IPEC programming. Where relevant, comments on specific action programmes were made, but detailed comments on each partner's work would have required more time than was available given the need to cover programmes in three different countries.

The evaluation involved the participation of stakeholders wherever viable. Interviews used a basic list of questions as a backbone, but included specific lines of analysis as appropriate. As the evaluation proceeded, questions were enhanced to follow specific lines of enquiry that were emerging.

Some minor issues arose during the evaluation. First, the project had recently completed stakeholder workshops in Metro Manila and Jakarta, and a workshop took place in Bangkok during the week of the evaluation. This meant that a separate event for evaluation purposes would have been an unacceptable drain on partners' time. Instead, the evaluation used existing workshop outputs, and discussed with project partners to devise a useful way of proceeding with workshop plans.<sup>5</sup> These processes enabled extraction of information, and the surrounding context

---

<sup>5</sup> In Thailand, the evaluation workshop was combined with the final stakeholder workshop. An evaluator's exercise was part of the agenda. In Metro Manila, the key implementing partners chose to conduct two sessions: a smaller group session for all project partners, and a wider stakeholder meeting which aimed to increase government involvement and devise plans for future advocacy action on CDT. In Jakarta, a shorter evaluation meeting was held for close project partners, with additional discussion of future steps.

(i.e. one of discussion on project progress rather than investigative evaluation) led to relatively frank and open interchanges.

Secondly, the mid-term evaluation was used as a small part of this final evaluation, rather than a key aspect as had originally been intended. The mid-term evaluation was carried out as a self-evaluation, and did not lead to any significant changes in direction on the part of any partners. It is a valuable and recent document, yet it does not provide the detail that a final evaluation would use.

Lessons and recommendations are chiefly aimed at ILO-IPEC but are relevant to others. There is additional information for US-DOL, the donor. Implementing partners may also find the report useful.

Field visits were a major aspect of the process. In all cases, these were conducted in the respective capital city. For Thailand, a visit to Chiang Rai was also included. See Annexes for details.

### **Format of this report:**

- The report starts with this short introductory section.
- The main findings are in section B, and respond broadly to the questions posed in the Terms of Reference. Findings cover more than one country, with specific country references as appropriate.
- Section C provides key lessons and recommendations sub-regionally and by country.
- Annexes follow.

**Action research - research or action?** The aim of action research is usually to uncover and document knowledge whilst engaging in direct work. This process is explained in various project outputs.<sup>6</sup> The project had one research partner and several implementation partners in each country, enabling both research and action to proceed. Additionally, the Thai programme involved more direct action. But in reality, the work was at times a mixture of action along with research, rather than 'action research'. This situation is probably unavoidable given the need to work with organizations that have been involved in drug related issues. It means that where appropriate the following text is at times divided into 'action' findings and 'research' findings, but in many cases the distinctions are blurred.

**Attribution and impact:** One of the project's strengths has been its ability to build on existing work on broader drug issues by adding a child focus concerning trafficking, production, etc. It was repeatedly apparent that work in this field was only possible where bodies had prior engagement in the community, with government partners, and in schools. Consequently, some achievements are not directly and solely attributable to IPEC-provided inputs.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, full impact will take a long time to discern: 'withdrawn' children may return to previous labour, or more positively, government may in future years pick up and replicate ideas demonstrated by the project.

Sustainable development work builds on existing skills, interests, political incentives, or economic imperatives. It is also likely to promote approaches that UN agencies, donors, international NGOs, communities, and local or national governments are interested in supporting.

---

<sup>6</sup> See the PAOR reports for Indonesia and Thailand, for example.

This means challenges over attribution may be a positive sign of appropriateness rather than a weakness! Some small cases from this project: NGOs in Metro Manila were already looking to expand work with communities on drugs before the project (although not on children and drug trafficking); target schools in Thailand were already working with children on drug issues; governments in all countries appear to be very gradually developing more sophisticated policies on drugs and children. These are all positive developments that IPEC can help support, and monitor its own impact on these issues over time.

## **B: EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES**

This section responds to set issues with reference to all three countries.

### **B1: Project design – logic, coherence, practicality**

Generally, the approach adopted was sound. Most valuable was the selection of a focal research agency for each country. This ensures more local appropriateness. Focal agencies were involved in research prior to the development of the project, and in early situational analysis. They also proposed the other action programme partners in most cases, and had a key role in developing proposals with them. At this stage it was probably appropriate to work with non-governmental bodies rather than directly with government, given the need to generate more knowledge.

Strategic questions can be asked about the research work approach. It is not entirely clear why the defined PAOR approach was applied to all stakeholders. PAOR in this format involved extensive work developing case studies. This is valuable, but may not be the most useful approach for developing a body of knowledge that can be applied in future, to advocate with government or other big players, build networks, or even to develop partner capacity. Positively, the research process was interpreted locally in different ways over time, and the project design enabled this to happen.

In Indonesia, stakeholders stated that they would have preferred a more clearly defined relationship between the research institute and the action partners. A clear MoU could have helped solve later misunderstandings. Some in Thailand felt that similar issues also applied.

**Avoiding danger to project staff, partners, and beneficiaries through grounded, informed approaches:** In order to work on drugs issues given strong police-led anti-drugs campaigns in all countries, partners had to tread carefully, and prioritise prevention rather than withdrawal. Working directly with users and traffickers could have led to direct conflict with police and authorities pursuing legal action.

Some danger was evident in all countries at the community level. Key risks come from the community dynamics of drug sales, trafficking, and police responses. Parents may object to project actions, especially if they profit from child involvement in drugs or are seriously addicted themselves. Criminals involved in drugs may use violent force if their businesses are threatened. Police often react with force themselves, creating dangerous scenarios. (Some police may at times be involved in criminal drug-related activities. Local anecdotal evidence of this, which will remain necessarily confidential, emerged in all three pilot countries.)

The most explicit example of danger to project partners was of a schoolteacher accidentally caught in a crossfire between armed police and armed alleged drug traffickers in a Thai village. *Thai police action against drug traffickers, and the traffickers' responses, may create considerable risks for child beneficiaries as well as project partners, in addition to those children orphaned by the deaths of parents in such conflict during the government's 'war on drugs'.* Violence has unfortunately led to the loss of thousands of lives since early 2003, and orphaned

children as a result of this violence exist in IPEC pilot project sites in Bangkok, Chiang Mai and Chiang Rai.<sup>8</sup>

The project's response, of working through local partners who know the situation in all three countries, was appropriate – although in future some policy engagement may be possible. Partners were given scope to devise ways around these challenges and a viable set of models emerged. In this way, other risks to project partners appear to have been minimised. Note that less flexibility might have led to non-cooperation from local partners given personal safety concerns, or exposed people to danger.

**Stakeholder capacity** was generally appraised accurately, with some exceptions:

- In Indonesia, capacity to conduct community level work may have been overestimated. This is partly a result of the risks of involvement with drug related work, and partly of top-down government and cynicism over the role of NGOs. Additionally, NGOs had less community-based experience to draw from than in Metro Manila or Bangkok, and levels of community organisation are lower. Target indicators for community leadership involvement in the project were not met. More careful assessment of the environment might have led to different objectives, or possibly to the development of links with different partners.
- In Indonesia, early support to ensure reporting could be carried out effectively was not sufficient. Communication appeared to break down, and partners received no feedback on information provided.
- Administration: Some partners in each country found the accounting burden of the project challenging, and would have appreciated more support from ILO. In Thailand, the administrative burden placed on NYDC as a focal agency was under-estimated. Whilst NYDC has strong capacity to manage projects or processes, more comprehensive appraisal would have demonstrated a need to provide administrative resources to cope with the burden of reporting – receiving from implementing agencies and providing to IPEC. Since the arrangement chosen in Thailand – using an implementing partner that acts as a focal point – is recommended as a practical way of working appropriately and with limited overheads in future, it is worth noting that there is also a need to appraise partner administrative capacity at the start and provide support as required.
- Language: Most stakeholders in Indonesia, Thailand and even the Philippines (as well as most of the rest of the world) do not work comfortably in English, and should not be expected to. It is incumbent on IPEC to accept reports in languages that people use, or to translate them, or to find an intermediary agency that can work in both languages. Likewise, national meetings and national outputs (reports etc.) should be in a language that people will use.
- In all countries, capacity building on reporting etc. could have come at the start of the project rather than later or not at all.
- Burden of reporting. If IPEC is to free up time for key issues like upstream advocacy, gender mainstreaming, or partner capacity building, then it needs to reduce reporting burdens – for partners and for its own staff. Currently, this is a major constraint on performance and effectiveness. A commonly held view is that ILO administrative and reporting requirements are too detailed, repetitive and time consuming. As with all organisations, some reporting and accountability is necessary. But it repeatedly emerged that the burden of reporting for IPEC staff and partners is greater than it is under many other projects run by public bodies such as other UN agencies or donors.

---

<sup>8</sup> The project responded in some communities with financial or livelihood generating programmes for orphans or their guardians.

**IPEC's own capacity** was less consistently appraised. This suggests that projects need to realistically estimate office and staff capacity for specific locations, especially if operating in more than one country.

- In the Philippines, clear reporting lines and allocations of responsibility supported productive relationships with partners. Support from other office staff (accounts, information) also helped.
- In Thailand, staff changes meant that capacity to support the programme diminished over time. The key project coordinator for Thailand and the sub-region shifted jobs and was not fully replaced.
- In Indonesia, staff changes and management challenges meant that no one took clear responsibility. Reporting and management tasks slipped, and damaged relationships with partners.
- The project demonstrates the value of a fairly hands-off approach, allowing national programmes to evolve. This also has some shortcomings (a balance is hard to achieve and regional projects too often over-emphasise the regional level at the expense of national appropriateness). But in this case, some key sub-regional information management tasks such as filing, reporting and monitoring progress could have benefited from more attention. More coordination or secretarial support may have helped. Improvements in the line of responsibility for national level management (either to a sub-regional figure or to a national manager) would have helped address issues as they arose.

**A top-down approach** was at times apparent. In all countries, intermediaries talked about receiving unclear instructions for implementation that they had not been involved in designing. One respondent said that some IPEC correspondence in one country consisted of 'downloaded instructions'.

**Project management** demonstrated strengths and weaknesses. The mid-term evaluation found that 'The project has become an integral part of the IPEC programmes in each country....'. Whilst this is true on paper, the reality has been that the programmes in Indonesia and Thailand (less so in the Philippines) have suffered from a lack of management attention. This created a major administrative burden on the respective focal point organisations, and damaged their relationships with IPEC to the extent that in both countries the evaluator was informed that two organisations would be reluctant to work with IPEC again. More positively, IPEC staff state that at the end of a project meeting in 2004, all partners in Thailand - including NYCD, the coordinating agency - pledged to continue to work with IPEC. Partners in Thailand were able to overcome difficulties in the past, and agreed that they may have under-estimated their own workload in this instance.

Section 3.3 of the project document spells out planned linkages with other international agencies and projects. Elsewhere, the document notes that 'given due consideration to the social and political sensitivity of the issue, the sub-regional office will work closely with an informal experts' group in Bangkok to provide guidance to the project and to facilitate its activities.' The proposed linkages were not established, and the informal group did not function.

The project document states that 'the IPEC National Program Manager, being the focal point of IPEC's overall country framework, will coordinate the project with the National Steering Committees.' This happened only loosely in Indonesia, and in Thailand the evaluator was informed that there was no manager for a long period. It is also unrealistic to expect National Steering Committees to give much attention to a project that is spending only US\$100,000 per

country, most of which supports NGOs and research bodies on an issue that is of little interest to traditional ILO partners.

The project mentions that in addition to 10% of the time of a technical officer in charge, a Project Assistant (national) will be recruited to help with the daily management, support and follow up action at country level. The Project Assistant will be hired under this project and will devote 100% of her/his time.' This only happened during the start of the programme, as far as the evaluator is aware.

**Relations with partners** are fundamental to long-term success, and the project shows strengths and weaknesses here. The project did meet partners, notably in May 2003 and September 2004. In the Philippines, relations were clearly stronger than elsewhere. In one country, it was found that no IPEC staff from the national office or sub-regional headquarters had ever visited any of the project sites, despite all of them being in the capital city. The same issues were found with higher-level contacts at the national level, where the necessary time, patience and humility had not been in evidence. In such a short programme, this is perhaps unavoidable, but in order to integrate drug-related programming into longer-term work within TBPs, relationship building needs to be prioritised. This means spending more time building relationships (and presumably less time reporting), longer-term time horizons for programmes with partners, and genuine efforts to find 'common ground' or 'entry points' with partners rather than promoting a single pre-figured model, especially at senior levels.

Partners complained particularly about financial delays in disbursement, and the need to account fully for expenditure before receiving funds. For many NGOs this is extremely impractical.

**Logic in programme design** was generally acceptable. The overall approach adopted identified and recognised the critical issues, and did not over-estimate knowledge or ability to intervene at this stage. The project document included some unsubstantiated comments and loose interpretation of background data (see section 1.2. of the document for example), as well as statements on the 'moral' damage of drug use that are personal views rather than objective social findings. However, given the more comprehensive country-level studies, this is not a serious concern.

## **B2: Appropriateness of design**

The healthy distance between partner agencies and IPEC meant that local appropriateness was reasonably assured. The project model was different for each country, suggesting good planning and design sensitivity. A 'SPIF' strategic planning exercise was completed, although it is hard to envisage how specific any such analysis will be if conducted sub-regionally rather than at the national level. More positively, initial drafts of the national Action Programmes were used as inputs into the design of the sub-regional project, including the outputs and indicators. In the case of the Philippines, the initial proposed Action Programmes (which were based on the previous situation analysis) were later revised to fit into the final design of the sub-regional project.

**National appropriateness** was not helped by a design frame that stressed consolidated sub-regional activities as well as outputs and indicators. Whilst the sub-regional and the national levels were distinguished, the designated national level activities were generally the same for all countries (see for example the activities column of the logical framework). Local variation occurred through interpretation by partners, who had to submit their own work proposals to IPEC for each action programme. But the main project reporting processes, and the lack of a

national approach (except that employed by NCYD, the partner agency for Thailand) hindered appropriate project development.

Examples of this trend include uniform outputs, workshop processes, and plans for task forces or steering committees that are identical for each country. Given that in reality each country is different, and will require tailored approaches it suggests a lack of national level input at the design stage. The impacts of this were felt during the project – especially over efforts to engage stakeholders in the wider community or at the policy level – i.e. those outside the project, for whom more appropriate and considered approaches will be required.

*There was less sensitivity or appropriateness when it came to working upstream with government, rather than downstream with partners. National IPEC offices did not map out appropriate and realistic linkages or advocacy strategies with higher bodies.* In each country, the same arrangement of project steering committee and task force was proposed. In each case, it fell short of expectations. More locally appropriate, long-term, and participatory approaches to linking with government are required for any further work that is planned at the national level or below.

At this stage of the project, there was little analysis of what policy changes or other fundamental shifts are required, and how to achieve them. This is understandable in a short research-based project. But it will be a necessary component of future work in such a complex and holistic field, where drug-related child labour is linked to a web of other drug-related issues, which in turn are linked to a bevy of social, legal, economic and other factors. Government policy on drugs tends to be dictated by crime considerations: entry points at all levels are limited and need to be carefully thought through.

**Selection and definition of sector:** For IPEC, CDT is not the most obvious sector of child labour to focus on: it is informal, often buried amongst other activities, and further hidden by its illegal and dangerous nature. From one perspective, this means that IPEC should prioritise other, easier sectors. From another, these are precisely the reasons why IPEC should be involved, and in any case it is a stated commitment in ILO Convention 182.

Engaging directly with children involved in the field of drug trafficking is not the best course of action, as the project demonstrates. CDT needs to be approached as part of policies, interventions and community responses to drugs more widely, prioritising the angle of children's needs and focusing on those districts, families or individuals more likely to be involved in labour aspects of the sector. This is the case for much work on child labour, so CDT is not a unique sector in this aspect.

Fears over the dangers of engaging in CDT given risks from both criminals and police are genuine. The project has found ways to engage that take such risk into account, and avoid undue danger. Original project documentation may not have considered this factor in detail, but partners were forced to by necessity during implementation and have developed a strong body of knowledge on options to pursue.

More widely, IPEC has no statement of its perspective on responses to drug issues. A child-focused institution could consider developing overall guidelines on how to approach and prioritise the interests, needs, and rights of children affected by drugs and at risk from related WFCL. There is otherwise a risk of adopting a somewhat reactionary or moralistic line on drug involvement, or prioritising it above other equally damaging problems facing children in especially difficult circumstances. Experienced specialists as well as community members in all



countries mentioned that most of the problems they deal with arise from the social context of drug use and trafficking rather than the substances themselves. This means that approaches should be situated in the context of problems children are facing (as indeed they have been so far) rather than as part of efforts to stamp out drug use.

**Technical issue: injection.** The project does not deal directly with injection, harm reduction or associated issues. In Indonesia, injection of drugs is considered by many to be the most dominant mode of transmission of HIV/AIDS, and in all countries it is a significant mode of transmission. Poverty, youth or culture are not barriers against risky injection. Rates of needle use are high in Myanmar and Cambodia, for example. Even if children are injecting drugs very rarely at present, there is no guarantee that this will continue in future. The project could look more closely into this issue and related experience of harm reduction for future phases.

### **B3: Identifying beneficiaries, targeting interventions**

**Summary:** Identification was carried out through earlier research, and by linking researchers with active organisations using existing contacts. Partners' knowledge of beneficiaries enabled careful targeting. A systematic mapping process might have revealed more potential partners in other areas, but for a short research programme the design was adequate. Some key issues emerge to note for future interventions.

**Tracking beneficiaries:** The PAOR research process attempted in most cases to identify and track specific beneficiaries. This was not only done to monitor progress, but also as part of the research. It was carried out with a high level of detail and documentation in all programmes in the Philippines. In Indonesia it was also completed, especially for SEKAM's work with street children, and also with the two other NGOs. In Thailand, the research was less able to identify specific children but such an approach was integrated into support.

For action interventions rather than just research, community and school based approaches all involve identification of children. Much of this had been done by partners prior to IPEC support, or was already ongoing. Work with schools in Thailand often involves monitoring individual children, having assessed all children according to degree of risk by dividing them into three categories. Note that this process is part of Thai government policy rather than a method introduced by the project. For the two target schools in northern provinces of Thailand, IPEC support had enabled identification of specific beneficiaries who had suffered from the impact of drugs. Often this meant that their parents had been killed (by drug traffickers or allegedly by police) or imprisoned. For community work in Thailand, such methodical identification was not done, but in many cases community workers had themselves identified specific at-risk children. For example, in one community (Charoendarn community, Nong Jok district, Bangkok), community leaders had identified 16 drug users who needed assistance, and had received it.

**Agreeing on numbers of beneficiaries:** This demands strong design cooperation between IPEC and implementing partners, in order to ensure that: a) realistic numbers of beneficiaries are chosen, and b) the partners maintain a balanced, holistic approach rather than being 'led by the numbers'. In most cases, this was achieved successfully. In Indonesia, some partners (ARTI and SEKAM) told the evaluator that the project did not cooperate sufficiently in this field, and that they were instructed in the early stages of the project to revise numbers without adequate participation.

**Recording the tracking process:** there was not a systematic way of monitoring numbers of beneficiaries. It would have been relatively simple to set up a sub-regional project spreadsheet at the start of the project, and to monitor change over time. Some target numbers appeared to change over time: beneficiary numbers in Thailand are quoted in various places as being either 300 or 340 children. It is not clear if this is a result of project changes, re-drafts, or an inconsistency.

**Working with partners:** It is important to note that, especially for such a short project, the past experience and ‘social capital’ of partners was a fundamental issue. The project was designed in such a way that it could benefit from partners’ existing abilities and contacts, rather than rigidly depending on a set delivery model. Where such capacity does not exist, future implementation will be challenging if adopting similar approaches.

**Drug issues and confidentiality** – a key issue in all countries: given the legal context and heavy police responses to drug issues, especially trafficking, confidentiality is critical. This is not a simple issue of removing names from records, since it affects willingness to cooperate with the project, and challenges the wisdom of identifying traffickers, users, or others. In all three project countries, the juvenile justice system is only partially developed, and detention processes are harsh – often failing to divide adults from children, for example – and ineffective at preventing repeat offences.

**Classification into users and traffickers:** Dividing child users from child traffickers can be counterproductive. Although it enables targeting of child labour (trafficking), it runs various risks. These were apparent in all countries, in different ways. All countries struggled with applying these distinctions. In practice, most action partners did not use the distinction. Of the research partners, only ARTI in Indonesia applied a modified version of the distinction in their work – in Thailand and the Philippines it was effectively dropped.

- Criminalising children: identifying traffickers as distinct from users runs the risk of exposing children to the police or criminal processes. Where possible it helps to keep most children out of police channels.
- Jeopardising project success and the safety of project workers or participants: tackling traffickers directly brings project workers and participants into contact with ‘criminal’ elements, including adult traffickers as well as police.
- Child well-being: child users and child traffickers are often in similar situations. A holistic approach is needed that encompasses the needs of children who are involved in drugs, or at risk of such involvement. All such children are in a high-risk category of exploitation through one of the WFCL.

**Prevention and withdrawal:** All partners found withdrawal difficult to work on, and *a strong case was made for focusing on prevention rather than withdrawal*. Issues of criminality in particular made it very hard to approach individuals involved: parents deny involvement or refuse access; schools deny such a problem exists; governments will promote a policing response as opposed to social support; police may press project staff for information, and effectively silence parents, teachers or children; traffickers will not co-operate; and children are stigmatised by neighbours or taken into custody.

Withdrawal is also related to **rehabilitation** programmes and centres. These are an area of concern in all countries. If the programme is to tackle withdrawal in future, then it may have to improve rehabilitation services – a very challenging task.

IPEC states that prevention was the original project aim, but communication and documentation did not clarify this. Some indicators as well as the language of the development objective and intermediate objectives suggest withdrawal as an option. Project partners ended up doing prevention, but explained to the evaluator why they were not doing withdrawal (as if they felt it was an original aim). Perhaps this simply reflects a comparison with other IPEC projects.

**Age of beneficiaries:** Project partners were all aware of IPEC's approach to age as found in ILO conventions. These age ranges were applied where possible. But vulnerable youths may be above or below an age limit of 18, especially for community or street-based work on drug issues. Partners and ILO took a sensible, pragmatic approach during implementation.

**Community approaches:** a further argument for focusing primarily on prevention (and on withdrawal where it occurs within a broader setting) comes from evidence of the value of community approaches. Clear feedback from most people concerned, in interviews, workshops and elsewhere demonstrated that drug use and trafficking is a holistic problem. Children at risk or involved are overwhelmingly those from poor areas, and often from unstable families within those poor areas. This means they are a) prone to a range of social problems relating to poverty including other WFCL, and b) difficult to reach in an isolated fashion. The key means of reaching these children are through bodies close to them: parents, peers, schools, and community groups.

**School-based approaches** offer the benefit of a strong delivery mechanism. Where government support exists, schools can engage in community approaches; in Thailand this has emerged as a successful practice. However, one key concern is that the most at-risk children, especially from trafficking rather than from drugs more widely, tend to be those outside school. School-based approaches, therefore, may offer a strong preventative model but will not necessarily reach many of those children already involved. This suggests that, where possible, children should be reached at an early age, before those most at risk drop out of education.

**Poverty focus:** The project aimed to target poor areas, and succeeded in doing so. School-based work is less poverty-focused than community work: the children most at risk are likely to drop out of school at an early age. Note also that children from richer areas in all three countries are also at risk of drug abuse, but are less prone to exploitation through WFCL.

**Capital city bias:** All action programmes, except two in Northern Thailand, are in capital cities. There may be drug trafficking problems involving children elsewhere: in rural or urban areas where use is high, or on trafficking routes. Future work should research these issues more widely.

#### **B4: Problems and needs of beneficiaries**

**Summary:** The project's early assessment and prior research helped. Implementing partners devised their own approaches according to local conditions and their own comparative advantages. This was valuable, and encouraged local appropriateness. As a research programme, needs analysis is part of project outcomes as much as part of project design. Casework on children enabled specific beneficiary needs to be defined. However, there was little evidence of checks or balances to ensure that gender and other social issues were taken into concern.

**Ethnicity and social stratification:** Project partners were well aware of local issues relating to ethnicity in most project areas.<sup>9</sup> However, this was not reflected in IPEC programming. The situation was similar to that of gender issues (see below) - high levels of local knowledge but little incorporation into strategy, policy, training, or project documents except at the grassroots level.

In all three countries the issue of accessing government or other services is central to combating drug problems: the need to be included in opportunities or service facilities is critical, as became evident through interviews and field visits (all these countries are middle income rather than poor, and services are available to many). Minority communities are often marginalized from services. More specific examples of the need to include understanding of ethnicity as an aspect of design and capacity building for IPEC and local partners include: issues of citizenship and human rights for ethnic minorities in Northern Thailand; evidence of a romantic and somewhat unrealistic perception of upland minorities in Thailand on the part of ethnic majority project partner staff, leading to programming that may not equip youth for integration into a modern economy; low educational attainment levels for Muslim youth in Bangkok; peer values, gang violence and youth in Jakarta or Metro Manila; language issues and participation of less educated participants in 'middle class' settings like workshops in all countries. All of these issues relate directly to drugs, and programs to combat drug use. In Thailand, it is also possible that many migrant children from neighbouring countries are involved in drug issues.

**Gender:** For all programmes, partners were aware of gender issues, could provide a gender-based breakdown of the situation and disaggregated data. Women and men were employed more or less equally by partner organisations. Understanding of gender and community dynamics was fairly high, especially at the local level. However, this information tended to 'evaporate' in reporting: the final PAOR reports contain only a little detail on gender issues. This is not surprising, given that the initial project document contains no mention of gender or of women, nor expresses a need to investigate them as part of the research. PAOR reports do not adequately address gender issues, although a good body of knowledge is being built up – as interviews with stakeholders revealed. Reports mention a need to consider gender issues in training, and to advocate for child and gender sensitive policies/programs specific to children/youth in drugs. This means that reporting, advocacy and models in future will need to incorporate gender aspects more than has been the case. IPEC can ensure that its own staff and partner organisations have the capacity to take gender issues on board.

On average, about 10-20 % of beneficiaries identified were girls. As far as can be discerned, this reflects the numbers of users / traffickers prevalent in society. As gender values change over time with increasing modernisation, this percentage may increase. There may also be under-reporting as the stigma attached to 'delinquency' is generally higher for girls. Furthermore, various stakeholders reflected on the differing responses of boys and girls to drug use or trafficking. There are many gendered aspect of boys' and girls' responses to drug issues, encompassing peer pressure and responses, gender expectations and roles, vocational training appropriateness, support activity selection, etc. A participatory approach to many issues helped ensure some appropriateness across the board, but these are important issues to watch in future work.

---

<sup>9</sup> Work in Chiang Rai and Chiang Mai, Thailand, is predominantly with marginalized upland minority groups; in Bangkok the key NGO partner has good connections with Islamic minority communities, as reflected in many of the project sites; in Jakarta, there are issues of ethnicity that relate to youth gang violence and other broader tendencies within Indonesian society; in Metro Manila, some similar issues exist, with a huge cultural and class divide evident as well.

Gender issues involve adult community participants as well as children. Community work generally targets women, but with fathers being key to accessing children in many places, and some evidence suggesting that male role models can assist in decreasing anti-social or self-harming behaviour, it will help to engage fathers where possible. Where the project intends to work with government, it will find that a dominance of women at the community level is replaced by a dominance of men in local government.

Perhaps most importantly, in all countries, reproductive and sexual health (RSH) is a core concern for the target population. Given that social side effects of drugs are usually the most critical problems (as many expert interviewees attested), serious issues such as HIV/AIDS awareness, family planning, and sexual violence are highly relevant to all work in this field. In Thailand and in Indonesia, this is recognised: although more could be done, RSH is integrated into approaches. However, it is a result of partners' own action, not IPEC action, and in the Philippines, RSH is not integrated into approaches. This is a major gap. IPEC should ensure that these issues are mainstreamed as a key part of future interventions in this field. A huge body of global and national experience in addressing all aspects of RSH in difficult environments has by now been developed, and can be adapted for application in this context.<sup>10</sup>

## **B5: Achievement of intended outputs**

Intended project outputs were:

*1. Preparatory output: Planning, coordination and implementation mechanism put in place for action-oriented research (Thailand, Philippines, and Indonesia), pilot interventions (Thailand), and sub-regional co-ordination.*

**Comment:** This was achieved, although some stakeholders complained it should have happened *before* rather than parallel to next steps

*2. Guidelines on the participatory action-research methodology developed on the use of children in the production, sales and distribution of drugs developed and tested.*

**Comment:** Guidelines were produced. A synthesis study of the methodology is available in draft form. It is unclear why such an emphasis was placed in the project on developing research guidelines, rather than outputs that might have been more valued by key external stakeholders in government or elsewhere.

*3. Consolidated/synthesis report produced on the nature, magnitude, and possible interventions on the problem of involvement of children in the production, sales and trafficking of drugs in Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines.*

**Comment:** Completed, as a summary of national level reports. It is assumed that this report is aimed at other sub-regional bodies or organisations, but this is not clear. Although a valuable resource, this report and other reports do not appear to have been designed with a clear audience in mind. The sub-regional activities stated in the project matrix appear to have been only partially carried out.<sup>11</sup>

*4. Models of direct action intervention on children involved in drug sales/production/trafficking designed in all countries, with pilot implementation in target communities in Thailand.*

---

<sup>10</sup> For comments on gender specific to Metro Manila, see file note: *Gender Observation in the Site Visits Regarding the ILO-IPEC Action Programme on Children in Drugs*, Yeon Me Kim, ILO Philippines, 2004.

<sup>11</sup> Activity 1.2.4 of the project plan – 'publish and distribute the consolidated report' – is not yet under way.

**Comment:** These have been produced for each country. Again, an ‘identikit’ approach to the format of each report suggests that they could have been better tailored to the needs of specific audiences.

## **B6: Has the project achieved its objectives?**

The logic linking the overall development objective and the more specific immediate objective seems fair. In terms of supporting the project’s immediate objective of *enhancing government and other concerned national partners’ understanding* of the issues involved, there are shortcomings.

Achievement of the objective as stated is dependent on a process that engages national stakeholders rather than on production of documents. The understanding of project implementation partners was definitely increased, but for those outside the project domain there has so far been less success.

**Documentation outputs:** improving the participatory design process. Generally, a high standard of documentation was produced. The involvement of national level research partners assures this, and also means that the process builds national research capacity in the field. Guidance on format etc. was also given. In terms of providing a basis for future action by IPEC, considerable data is now available. However, this does not assure success according to the immediate objective.

Influencing a wider body of stakeholders is dependent on longer-term and appropriate processes. There are various models or means for achieving such an objective, and the appropriate path will depend on the context, partner interests and skills, etc. Actual documented outputs are often the end product, rather than the start of such processes, if the documents are going to be adopted and used by key parties.

In the Philippines, a government official stated that the research outputs were good, but were not the kind of information that government was looking for. Although this is only one person’s view, discussions with officials as part of project design, and continued dialogue over time, would have helped build outputs genuinely useful to government.

No dissemination strategy for outputs was identified. A predetermined strategy would probably have been a mistake, but defining a strategy and implementing it during the course of the project would have been valuable – had time or funds allowed.

This project had little scope for engaging in this way. Perhaps this is inevitable given the early stage of engagement in the issue and the limited timeframe. In that case the objective was unrealistic. For future programmes, if wider impact is to be attained, a longer and more intensive effort will be needed, with more nationally and collaboratively defined outputs and a stronger emphasis on developing processes that build entry points for change over time. Much of this work will be the responsibility of IPEC partners, but IPEC staff also have a key role to play in facilitating and advising, in encouraging networking, and in building high level contacts.

**Language of documentation:** Documents are overwhelmingly in English: evidence that they were written primarily for IPEC, and to fulfil IPEC project requirements. If they are to ‘enhance

government and other concerned national partners' understanding' (as stated), then they should be in local languages first.

This problem is partly an inherent difficulty within a sub-regional project, since the sub-regional needs are different from the country needs in terms of language as well as other aspects. Donors, and IPEC itself, also have reporting needs that require English documentation. But a process that starts with the purpose quoted above would have to begin in local languages for documents such as research reports that are aimed at national partners. This point relates to comments above about a lack of dissemination strategy.

**Strengthening community organisations to work on child labour:** In all countries, responses were broadly positive – people generally appreciated the inputs the project had provided. By working with local organisations, encouraging research, and promoting a community-based approach, capacity was supported. Furthermore, networking between communities, and between research institutes, NGOs and communities was facilitated.

- In schools in Thailand, peer approaches were increasingly involving students in anti-drug programmes, and enabling teachers to identify at-risk students more effectively.
- In Metro Manila, community-based groups have developed new skills, confidence and contacts.
- In Jakarta, new contacts, and improved skills, are enabling NGOs to work better with communities and begin engaging with government.
- Everywhere, understanding of CDT has improved.

But note that capacity building in action-oriented research itself, although useful, may not be the best approach. Other, more locally defined skills will probably be more appropriate in each case if longer-term support is to be provided in future.

## **B7: Indicators – validity, achievement**

IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
At the end of the project, public institutions and stakeholders in Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines will have enhanced their understanding on the targeted recruitment and use of children in the production, sales and distribution of illegal drugs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of knowledge gained &amp; data collected for future action to combat the use of children in the production, sales and trafficking of drugs in different settings</li> <li>2. Number and types of feasible interventions identified for follow-up implementation by stake holders involved in action research</li> <li>3. Number of advocacy campaigns conducted by stakeholders involved in action research</li> <li>4. Number of children involved in drugs received counselling services and referred to other service providers (Thailand)</li> <li>5. Number and quality of interventions undertaken by stake holders during the implementation of action research</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government and stakeholder plans and records</li> <li>• Project monitoring</li> <li>• Qualitative review</li> <li>• Questionnaires and feedback through the consultation process</li> </ul>

Generally, the indicators shown above were approached or met, as documented in project reporting (although the final Technical Progress Report is not yet available). However, some issues arise.

- *Indicator 1:* It is impossible at this stage to determine with any certainty whether information will be used in future, so this indicator is only of partial relevance. However, in

all countries, it seems likely that partners and IPEC wish to use knowledge gained, and there is some scope for government involvement.

- *Indicator 2:* The PAOR reports document possible approaches for all countries.
- *Indicator 3:* The project was too short to enable full development of advocacy work. This indicator was over-ambitious given the timeframe, and encouraged unsustainable efforts to reach government or other bodies. In all countries, implementers found that the required precursors to advocacy – partnerships, networks, contact with government, clear points to promote, etc. – were not yet developed and would take time, although the potential exists. Additionally, quantity alone is not a good indicator of effectiveness for advocacy work.
- *Indicator 4:* The evaluator assumes that this indicator is shown as referring to Thailand because in that country direct action programmes accompanied action research. In reality, the distinctions between the two appear to have become blurred over time and were not apparent. Additionally, quantity alone is not a good measure here: some of the key issues in the region are the quality of counselling and referral services, a high rehabilitation failure rate, and poor links with weak juvenile justice systems.
- *Indicator 5:* This standard indicator provides a mark for the project to follow. Reporting requirements, outputs, and evaluations, gave evidence with which to assess progress.

**National appropriateness and lack of national indicators:** Project indicators cover all three countries and sub-regional objectives. This means the reporting has to mix three separate programmes, and many action programmes, into one chart. It is hard to do this whilst retaining any true picture of progress on the ground. For Thailand, a set of national indicators was devised by NCYD, the research partner. But in the Philippines and Indonesia, this was not done, since the research partners only had a coordinating role in Thailand. It is recommended that in future, indicators be devised at the national level in regional projects wherever possible to avoid a level of abstraction that risks clouding the picture. The national level is the key level of impact.<sup>12</sup>

**Indicators at action programme level:** Most action programmes devised indicators and reported on success. The process for Thailand was different, given that NYDC had an anchor role for reporting on developments and financing partners. These indicators seemed generally acceptable, although of varied quality given different levels of exposure to funders' planning instruments. YPI in Indonesia applied unclear or non-quantifiable indicators, and would have benefited from more IPEC support at the design stage.

**Capacity building as an output / indicator:** A more integrated approach to capacity building in indicators and outputs at all levels would have been beneficial for ensuring that this aspect received sufficient attention during implementation and reviews.

## **B8: Implementation and effectiveness**

**Early / preparatory outputs:** In all cases, IPEC wisely supported existing strategies and partner interests. Partners seemed broadly content with capacity building for project delivery, although as a short research-based programme such inputs were limited. Participants expressed satisfaction at efforts to improve ability to conduct research, or to implement action work.

---

<sup>12</sup> 'The Indonesian team felt that there should have been an 'umbrella' logical framework at the country level and/or a country project document. The indicators of achievement and means of verification should also have been established.' (Quoted from mid-term evaluation)



Requests for further capacity building were commonplace, and should be a more integral part of future action.

In one country (Indonesia), most partners complained that action programmes started before the capacity building for research work. On various programmes, community capacity to implement was limited. However, such major constraints cannot realistically be fully overcome in such a short period, and partners generally made an impressive effort of improvising, adapting, and training as appropriate and necessary to ensure project outputs.

**Delivery of project outputs - quality, quantity, time:** The mid-term evaluation found that almost all of the activities planned had been implemented. This evaluation confirmed those findings through analysis of progress reports and independent verification. Progress since the mid-term evaluation has enabled the remaining activities to be completed. Numbers of children reached, activities provided, etc., were respectable.

This evaluation ‘drilled down’ to the level of action programmes, and confirmed that activities had generally been carried out successfully. A range of delays were however found:

- Delays between the earlier research in 1999-2001, and the start of this project. In Indonesia and the Philippines, some participants remarked that they were pleasantly surprised to see IPEC return, thinking that after such a long gap they had changed plans.
- Implementation was extended from 18 months to 24 months, and then 27 months. There are some reasons for this: changing staff in IPEC and partners; unrealistic timetables for work at the start; delays in financial reporting and transfers.
- Financial delays. These were remarked upon in all cases. See accompanying text box.

***Delays in financial flows - impact at all levels***

Delays in financial flows, and cumbersome systems or a lack of support to explain how to fulfil requirements, damage project effectiveness, and harm partnerships. The key Thailand project implementation and research partner had to advance personal funds to action partners at one point, given delays in receiving IPEC funds. Forwarding 30% of funds at the start is not considered enough for such a short programme: in the partner's experience, no other donor operates like this. At the time of writing, the research partner still has funds outstanding from ILO. IPEC was slow to reply to queries or reporting; problems arose *‘to the extent that we might have to reconsider if you ask us to continue in future.’*

At the level of the implementing agencies in the field, this delay was also felt and remarked upon. One community of minority villagers, in Chiang Rai, complained about delays in receiving funds. The community had to speak out in order to press the case, and at one point had to provide their own funds as a stopgap. The project-sponsored local youth sports team had to pull out of a local youth sports contest given lack of funds. The budget for making textiles came too late, meaning the project-supported textiles group missed the opportunity to market products at a key event. The partner agency NCYD did not blame IPEC alone for this, it recognised that the delay in reporting between partners and that NCYD also contributed to it.

**Action programmes as a delivery mechanism:** *Short (10-month) and small (almost exactly US\$20,000 in all cases) action programmes are not really suited to sustainable development work. It is a testimony to the ingenuity of IPEC and partner staff, rather than the system being employed, that projects worked. All programmes were budgeted at almost exactly the same amount, suggesting that the design was tailored to administrative requirements rather than reality on the ground.*<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Note that the research partners tended to receive repeat follow-on support.

**Shortcomings in delivery: advocacy and linking with external bodies:** Key shortcomings were found here, which threatened the achievement of the overall project objective. At the local level, these steps were found to be far harder than had been envisaged in project documentation. This reflects various issues:

- An unrealistic expectation of the time and preparatory needed for such work.
- Varying levels of existing 'social capital'; where links with local leaders or policymakers already existed, then the project could use them. Examples included 'barangay' officials in Metro Manila, education officials in Thailand, and expert individuals in Jakarta. Where they did not exist, the project will struggle to develop them in such a short time.
- Sub-regional planning without nationally appropriate strategies for engaging external stakeholders. Enhancing the understanding of others, as stated in the project's immediate objective, requires that the project reaches, and engages their attention. This is hard. It requires patience, strategy, contacts, and diplomacy. IPEC staff did not engage in this field; partners did to varying degrees, depending on their existing strengths.

## **B9: Project relevance**

**Did the project respond to the real needs of the beneficiaries?** The PAOR synthesis report states that the project implementers found the main problems/needs of children in this field to be:

- Education (out-of-school youth more likely to get involved than in-school youth);
- Family nurturance and support as children in drugs seem to have families with high levels of tensions/conflicts or disintegration;
- Support services (leisure/sports, access to social services) as children who gets involved in drugs do not seem to have alternative activities to occupy him nor a support system (e.g., a big brother/sister in he Philippines; youth/friendship camps and outreach/sports activities in Thailand, sports and band festivals in Jakarta);
- Young addicts need child-friendly and community-based rehabilitation or healing centres as city rehabilitation centres broaden children's drug networks.

In most cases, economic issues were also mentioned during this evaluation, especially low family incomes and lack of future opportunities for children. (Economic reasons were referred to far less often in Thailand, which is considerably wealthier than the other two countries and currently enjoys a fairly healthy macro-economic environment).

Broadly speaking, the project's action components tackled issues related to these factors. By placing drug issues in context, by working with existing bodies already engaged in similar work, and by conducting participatory research, the project helped ensure relevance and learn lessons to promote increasing relevance in future.

In terms of the importance of CDT as a field of engagement, children and drug abuse is an important social issue in all three countries, affecting many children and the subject of concerted government attention. Findings confirm that children are involved in WFCL through drug trafficking in all countries. Furthermore, involvement in drugs often leads to other forms of exploitative labour, including crime and prostitution. There is scope for further engagement in this field.

**IPEC's knowledge and comparative advantage in the sector** By now, IPEC is developing expertise in how to engage in this field for the first time. Findings show that CDT has

to be situated in its wider social context, and approached through the channel of existing organisations. Future success depends on ability to link to policymakers, adding a child perspective into broader anti-narcotic and social policy. It does not depend on knowing more about drugs.

IPEC's key comparative advantage is the potential to facilitate the entry of these issues into wider policymaking or action interventions on drugs and related social issues. This involves many steps including background research, networking, building partnerships or alliances, and encouraging local appropriateness. It is not critical that IPEC build up a body of narrow, technical knowledge in the field, but more important that future interventions learn from the broader lessons emerging out of this project.

### **B10: Local management structures and their participation in implementation**

This was limited by project design (see above), duration, and changes that led to an increasingly strong and police-led response to drug issues. Involvement of national steering committees in the project was challenging. Drug-related issues are overwhelmingly dealt with by police and related departments, not ILO's usual partners. In any case, even ILO's usual partners may be inappropriate in this context since in most cases the issue is of more concern to ministries of education, social welfare etc. than ministries of labour.

Additionally and importantly, this is a small project and as such is of little interest to senior policymakers. Lower-level entry points might have been more valuable. In most cases, more concerted efforts to promote links through one or two entry points in key relevant ministries would be more successful.

**Government commitment:** This is limited at present. The programme was too short and too small to achieve its objective in this context.

In all three countries, governments are pursuing drug reduction policies. There are openings that the project has already exploited to some extent: with schools in Thailand, and with local government at the grassroots - and potentially nationally - in the Philippines.

Note however that work on CDT is more likely to fit into community or child-based aspects of drug policy than into standard child labour policy avenues. Relevant government policy in this field concerns a range of issues including community service provision, juvenile justice, policing, referral, rehabilitation and detention processes, school action on drugs, etc. In doing so it can tackle CDT as a child labour issue, but success will probably come indirectly.

**Task Force and Steering Committee:** In all countries, these groups did not function effectively. Some useful contacts with individuals were built, for example on referral for children in Jakarta, but the general picture was of task forces that did not meet, governments that passed responsibility around or avoided meetings, and a lack of external involvement.

At this stage, after a short research project of this sort, this is not a major problem. But it suggests that the task force and stakeholder structures were not realistically designed around respective national conditions and the severe limitations of such a small, short project.

- Union and employer involvement is hard in this field. Unsurprisingly, there has been little, and ILO efforts to include unions or employer involvement did not get far (in Metro Manila, for example).
- In Indonesia, a Project Advisory Committee did not function properly. Attendance at workshops on the part of government officials was very low. Responsibility was passed to the NNB (National Narcotics Bureau), which found – accurately - that the project was only local in nature and passed duties on to a PNB (Provincial Narcotics Board). By this point the project was due to end. In any case, NNB and PNBs are overwhelmingly police-dominated, and the project could have looked at sub-committees of these structures where social issues will receive more attention.
- In the Philippines, partners do have good links with government. By the end of the project, partner NGOs (along with government departments) were devising ideas for taking the issue of CDT forward. This is a good example of appropriate, locally devised engagement that evolves through a process. IPEC was supporting and facilitating this. Existing NGO-government links that are very different from the other two countries in the project helped these achievements, as did IPEC involvement.
- In Thailand, potential exists through the project's collaboration with education facilities, and with NCYD, which has good government connections. The role of ILO or project structures in this has been minimal to date.

#### **B11: Effectiveness and value for money**

Action programme costs make up 60% of the total allocated project budget of US\$500,000. Cost per beneficiary estimates are hard to conduct accurately, and could be misleading given that CDT is a complex phenomenon. Overall, some 668 children and 1732 adults were reached according to the most recently available data. But given a) a focus on research for later use, b) the value of capacity building, c) the peer-to-peer cumulative influence of work, and d) the difficulty of linking cause and effect given existing work by others, it is impossible to calculate meaningful cost-per-child data.

Most of the project sites visited reported a marked drop in drug prevalence, a probable reduction in child involvement in trafficking, and general improvement in community or student welfare. Direct beneficiaries interviewed were generally positive about the provisions the project had made in most locations. However, these responses are often a result of parallel activities conducted by partners or other agencies, or a consequence of previous work and existing social capital.

It was noticeable that the more integrated the delivery mechanism is into local structures, the further donor funds will stretch. So the most community-focused action programmes outperformed their objectives and operate at low cost. KKPC in the Philippines, for example, stretched the funds further than had originally intended. In Thailand, school-based delivery builds on massive existing capital to stretch outputs further.

The most valuable returns exist in the form of lessons, models, contacts and networks that will foster any follow-up programme. Full returns on investment will not be realised unless follow up interventions take advantage of the opportunities created.

In summary, given an average allocated cost of only US\$167,000 per country, the returns are generally considered sufficient to justify the investment.

## **B12: Changes in external factors; monitoring and change to project plans**

The context changed during the period between early project design and implementation. *Changes in government policy had an impact, as campaigns against drugs were stepped up in all countries, especially in Thailand. This resulted in a more difficult working environment as drug crime was driven underground, and in some cases violence increased;* but it also helped to improve coordination, reduce drug problems, and galvanise action on the part of a wide range of government bodies.

These changes in external conditions, and lessons learnt as the project proceeded, led to modifications in partner actions. It was generally recognised in all countries over time that prevention work was more feasible, less dangerous, and more effective than withdrawal work. Generally, this flexibility did not lead to deviation away from maintaining core outputs.

Only minor changes were made to documents once the project was up and running. The project demonstrated valuable flexibility throughout: partners managed to achieve project outputs whilst using or modifying their own existing approaches, methods and contacts, and adapting to changing circumstances. In this way, gradual change occurred over time in each place, as demonstrated in the PAOR reports.

**Time Bound Programmes:** For future work, it will be important to start from a national perspective of the policy environment, and of potential to engage. IPEC's Time Bound Programmes will support this. The development of TBPs is a major change in external conditions, and the project provides a valuable springboard from which to engage in further work.

Some other points to note follow:

- In Thailand, the project sites and partners were changed following implementation difficulties that appear to have partly stemmed from a long delay in starting the project.
- The mid-term evaluation did not lead to significant changes in any country; there was little if any effort to change actions or discuss outcomes with partners. The evaluation was attached to the international stakeholder workshop rather than standing independently. Normally this could be a flaw, but given that it occurred only six months before the end of the project, it is understandable. Indeed, for such a short project a mid-term evaluation was probably not worthwhile and it should not be a requirement.

**Child labour monitoring:** This was primarily a research project. Child labourers were monitored and documented through a case study approach as part of PAOR, and in Thailand through school recording processes. *But it is unlikely that a systematic approach to child labour monitoring in this sector would be appropriate given its informal and illicit nature.*

Anonymity on the part of participants (children, parents and at times others) is an extremely important issue for this sector, and should be considered in future work.

## **B13: Opportunities for participation**

In general, the project usefully encouraged participatory approaches. Participation of children/youth, their parents and the community officials is central to project success, but there is

a need to select appropriate types of participation. In all the project sites, this was a key lesson learned.<sup>14</sup>

Project documentation at times misses an understanding of the need to define what forms of participation are ideal. It is not simply the case that 'more is better': more lessons could be learnt on how participation can work effectively. This varies depending on community values and organisation, local government structure, etc., and so on, and there is no substitute for experience in the issues to hand.

In all countries, the issue of youth participation was raised as a valuable aspect of the project and one that should be continued. It is important as an aim in itself, and as an instrumental way to assure effectiveness. This means involvement in implementation, and inputs into design, rather than token attendance at workshops.

In community work, family participation was stressed as a way to reach children as well as assure appropriateness. This includes fathers as well as mothers, given their important role in household decision-making – especially for sons.

In places, the research itself was not conducted along ideal participatory lines: ideally, researchers should be community members themselves. However, such work is hard to arrange in such a short timeframe unless existing relationships allow it, and this is not considered a major weakness.

Project design and implementation would benefit from more partner and external stakeholder participation, and from more consideration of how that participation should take place. Simply holding a workshop does not necessarily constitute meaningful participation – a good process needs more thought, and more shared planning.

#### **B14: Validity of the project approach and strategies, and potential to replicate**

Project research and outputs are designed to help IPEC develop further intervention in future. Contacts and experience developed support that process, and at this stage the project seems to have developed useful and practical lessons.

In some project sites, partners wish to expand to surrounding or other areas. This may be feasible, although the obvious reliance on existing organisational strengths may make it hard to replicate widely. In any case, as a research-based project, it is less about encouraging direct replication than about supporting future activities. Here, relationships with external stakeholders in all countries (notably government but also larger NGOs, other UN agencies, etc.) were not prioritised during the programme, meaning that future work will need to start from a fairly low base. The key points of engagement with government come through the research partner in each country, and in all cases – although especially in Indonesia and perhaps also Thailand – IPEC's relationships with the research partners have not been smooth.

The PAOR reports deal with models that worked, and the research process itself. This information is useful, and would be fully pertinent if IPEC wishes to scale up similar work in future. CDT is not a narrow, location-specific form of child labour. Scaling up to a few more

---

<sup>14</sup> The PAOR synthesis report includes this finding.

project sites may help demonstrate what can be done, but will not itself solve a problem that is distributed widely across hundreds of urban and rural neighbourhoods.

Research outputs are not always relevant to government policymakers, or to supporting interventions that engage with government (or support efforts to lobby government) in future. Further research might look more closely at what 'entry points' there are in government policies – at the local level, but also more widely. This demands a nuanced understanding, which some partners (especially but not only research bodies) have built up over time and could be tapped into, with far more knowledge than simply a list of relevant government policies.

**Using models with caution:** Models and case studies are often interesting, and many stakeholders expressed an interest to learn from experience elsewhere. However, all experience has to be applied locally and appropriately: there is a danger that producing models, or classifying projects into categories such as 'street', 'school', and 'community', will simplify emerging lessons and encourage duplication rather than developing local solutions. Successful future schemes should be 'owned' locally, i.e. devised and shared by national or partners who have had a major say in design as well as implementation. This involves working over time with partners to facilitate the development of new plans. Usefully, the PAOR reports and the synthesis report summarise context, experiences, lessons learnt and evaluations as well as outlining intervention models; this is a good basis for future work.

Participants in all countries requested more sharing of experiences through documentation, meetings and study tours. The interest in other places or countries' efforts did appear in this instance to be sincere.

## **B15: Sustainability**

This project is more about *phasing in* future work than it is about phasing out after completed outputs. As such it has developed viable ways to take the work forward, as intended from the outset. It is not possible to judge sustainability of outputs in the normal fashion.

For the action work rather than the research, sustainability is likely to be mixed, which is unsurprising given time constraints. Some capacity development of local organisations or networks, some awareness raising and other activities for parents and children, will have a sustainable impact. Since the project was short-lived (action programmes were only around a year in length, and under \$20,000), over-dependency of partners on project inputs has not become a significant issue. The nature of the activities pursued means that their immediate impact should be felt even if they cannot be continued. Additionally, many of the partners have alternative fundraising channels that they will pursue, and the project has helped identify such opportunities through networking and other processes. In several cases, partners that were not previously engaged in CDT issues have stated that they wish to pursue the work further, regardless of the availability of IPEC funding. This is the case with: NCYD in Thailand; NGO partners, and possibly research and government bodies in the Philippines; and NGO partners in Indonesia.

Partners, especially smaller NGOs or community bodies, could have benefited from discussions and sharing contacts on alternative funding opportunities should further IPEC support not be forthcoming, or be delayed.

For the research, some PAOR methodology learning will remain with partners, as well as the body of knowledge and networks developed. But overall project sustainability depends more on

how the research outputs are used. Here, some obstacles are found. Project outputs are likely to be used predominantly by an internal (ILO and partner) audience, even if this was not the original intention. This means that the likelihood of others adopting findings or recommendations is at this stage quite slim. Sustainability therefore depends on continued IPEC involvement to promote action – again, unsurprising given time constraints.

**Ownership:** Partners, who were not previously engaged in CDT issues, have decided that they wish to pursue the work further, regardless of the availability of IPEC funding. This includes research organisations, NGOs, schools and community groups.<sup>15</sup> This is a positive indication of ownership. IPEC's distanced management style and use of existing organisations, who fitted project aims into their existing work, means that ownership of many of the principles is as high as might reasonably be expected. In some cases, community ownership of the project is weaker than others, depending mostly on practices and working methods that existed before the project began. Community-based organisations that enable direct beneficiaries or relations to feel direct responsibility for an output are not created in 12 months, and where community links were not already strong there was insufficient time to change much. In Jakarta more than elsewhere, community relations were challenging – partly a result of people's expectations of top-down service provision by local government, and less experience of community-based NGOs.

In general, ownership of the project itself is not necessarily important and should not be a key concern. More significant is ownership or adoption of the issues involved and which the project promotes. This will be the challenge for future work.

**NGO capacity building:** This was an issue in all countries. Most felt they had benefited from support, although the knowledge of research methods was less useful than other aspects. Looking ahead, building the ability of NGOs, facilitating their efforts to network, advocate and link with government may be a critical part of future interventions in all countries.

**Will work to monitor child labour continue?** Some partners will continue monitoring children and drug issues, although not always as a consequence of the project. Many schools in Thailand are doing this anyway. The PAOR provided tracking tools that have been adopted in places (e.g. by some community and NGO partners in Metro Manila and Jakarta), and improved prior methods.

But note that child labour in CDT cannot be systematically monitored, since its existence will in most cases be denied – by authorities as much as children or their parents. IPEC should not in future aim to develop standard child labour monitoring systems for this sector.

**Have sustainable networks been developed?** Although at an early stage, there is evidence of useful networks and contact building in all cases. This forms a good basis for future work but is not sustainable at this stage.

---

<sup>15</sup> 'City officials also want to consult us now' – quote from Metro Manila NGO partner on their community work.



## C: LESSONS AND CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS

This section contains:

- General lessons for wider application that are drawn from project experience.
- Broad conclusions / recommendations relevant for further work.
- Conclusions / recommendations for each country.

Note that the general lessons for wider application, as well as conclusions/recommendations, will be relevant to any follow-up phase. For more information, refer also to the lessons and recommendation in the country PAOR reports, and the overall PAOR synthesis report.

### C1: General lessons

**Research** has generated useful findings, and provided entry points. But key stakeholders have not easily adopted findings, not least because it was not designed as part of an advocacy or engagement strategy. The PAOR reports do provide valuable data on the context and background of drug use and children for respective countries, as well as the specific case-work and action programmes. It is not clear that PAOR was the most appropriate tool for finding out this information and communicating it appropriately.

- *For more detail see paragraph 2 of B1 and paragraph 5 of B14.*

**Existing social or political capital** is essential for effective delivery, especially in such short projects. Where projects are flexible enough to build on, or harness, existing skills and capacity, or base themselves on active government policy directives, then success is more likely.

- *See para.6 of B3, and final para. of B8*

**Active government campaigns** against drugs in all countries have had mixed results. In most countries they do not adequately consider children's needs and rights. They tend to be dominated by crime considerations rather than welfare, social development, or rights. Engaging in policy debate will be worthwhile – this requires time, care and attention.

- *See paras 4-6 of B1, para. 1 of B12, and final recommendation for Thailand*

**Different intervention models** that have been developed give ideas about how to engage. No one model emerges as preferable – it depends on the situation and available experience in any one location, and all models should be adapted to local circumstances if employed in future. School-based approaches offer valuable opportunities to go to scale, if accompanied by policy engagement, but may miss out those children who have already left the school system.

- *See B14, especially subsection 'Using models with caution'.*

**Prevention:** Prioritise prevention work in this sector rather than withdrawal.

- *See B3, subsection 'prevention and withdrawal'.*

**Working through an intermediary organisation can be effective.** The relationship in Thailand, where the intermediary had a larger role than elsewhere, made a noticeable difference to the shape of the project, enabling more local definition of inputs and outputs. It might help to ensure clear definition of the relationship between the intermediary and other partners.

- *See first para of B1 and first para of B2.*

**Positive support from IPEC management can improve effectiveness.** Likewise, where IPEC staff do not have time to manage relationships well, work can suffer and partnerships can be damaged.

- *See subsections ‘IPEC’s own capacity’, ‘Working with partners’, and ‘Project management’, all in B1*

**Financial delays** affect implementation, and can harm relationships with partners.

- *See box in B8*

**Regional or sub-regional projects** are hard to manage whilst maintaining national appropriateness. For longer regional programmes, it will be imperative to ensure that nationally defined design is prioritised, and – unless adopting a hands-off approach which may be valid at times – adequate national management capacity exists.

- *See first three paras, B2*

Comprehensive **child labour monitoring systems may not be appropriate** for this field.

- *See end B12*

**High-level partners:** ILO should take time in each country to define and develop relations with relevant policymakers, advocates, NGOs or UN agencies, or other relevant bodies / people who have common interests. This means devising locally appropriate links, mechanisms or forums over time, rather than aiming to set up uniform steering committees and task forces.

- *See fourth para B2, and subsection ‘Relations with partners’ in B1.*

**Gender:** Gender issues are already mainstreamed in the DED guidelines and there is a separate ILO publication on gender issues in project design. However, application of these publications and guidelines is not guaranteed by their existence, as seen in this project. There is a need to take steps to ensure application, in order to avoid ‘gender evaporation’. Staff gender training currently in progress should help.

- *See B4*

**Ethnicity and other social issues:** Apply more general social analysis in project design, noting in particular potential issues of ethnicity and social exclusion. If IPEC does not have set outline procedures for such steps (to be adapted for each context), then it could consider devising them.

- *See B4*

**Longer timeframes:** Look at much longer periods of engagement for any future projects and for action programmes.

- *See last 2 paras, B8*

## **C2: Conclusions/Recommendations for IPEC (& donor/development partners)**

The general lessons above also apply as recommendations for any future initiative based on this project. Each recommendation given is justified by conclusions drawn from the main findings.

## On general approach and programming

**Further work though a country-based approach:** Consider a further series of interventions in this field. Aim to adopt a country-based approach to this work in future, whether as part of TBPs or otherwise. Try to build in some regional activities for exchanging experiences between partners. The focus should be on advocacy and mobilising broader involvement, with a component of direct action as part of the approach. Further research on specific fields may be necessary, and should also be developed as part of a process to galvanise involvement and change.

**Follow a holistic approach in this field in future:** CDT is a highly complex problem. It is geographically dispersed, and child drug users can rarely be easily separated from drug traffickers. Approaches that worked generally involved families, community bodies or schools. These findings, and the links between drug problems and a range of other issues, mean that a holistic understanding is required in order to engage effectively.

Additionally, it is hard – and can be counterproductive or even dangerous – to separate users from traffickers. There is only limited value in reaching a specified number of children unless the work is situated within the broader context of local problems, and the wider realm of relevant policy and government action. It follows that prevention works better than withdrawal. Working broadly on the problems that lead to drug prevalence may be the best entry point for future work.

**Partners:** The project did not have time to develop links with a wider range of agencies involved in or linked to this field. More could be done in future, to promote synergy and sustainability. IPEC could free up more staff and partner time to work on building relationships with implementing agencies and more senior figures in government or elsewhere. IPEC could also appraise partner administrative capacity more carefully and build support into projects where necessary. At high levels, ILO should take time in each country to define and develop relations with relevant figures through appropriate mechanisms, as pointed out more broadly in the general lesson subtitled *High level partners* (previous section).

**Delivery mechanism / intermediaries:** Working with a key implementing partner who can run smaller projects and also engage in upstream advocacy, lobbying, or networking is recommended for future work – in the design phase and for implementation. It enables local appropriateness and frees up IPEC staff time to look at building partnerships, developing government contacts, etc. It also allows for nationally defined and owned outputs.

**Research and awareness raising:** The knowledge base is still fairly low in most countries, although tackling this may well require awareness-raising rather than more research. There may be little need to gather more primary data unless it will help inform key counterparts. Aim to involve project partners and key policymakers (government etc.) in designing awareness raising or research-based outputs, so that they are involved in the process, and to ensure outputs are relevant. Outputs should primarily be in local language and format (and then translated into English if necessary). Locally defined methodologies and approaches may be more beneficial in the long run.

## On design

**Maximising impact:** For future programming, a greater emphasis on building ownership from the start of the design phase will help ensure that key stakeholders are engaged. Project outputs

were successfully delivered, demonstrating that it is possible to work in this difficult sector. But the immediate objective – to enhance knowledge of key stakeholders including government – was only partially completed. Engagement with key stakeholders was in most cases limited, at the local, national, and sub-regional levels. This is not surprising given the short duration of the programme; the immediate objective was perhaps too ambitious.

**Design:** *Aim for a long, participatory design phase for each country programme.* Given the holistic nature of the CDT ‘sector’, demonstrate flexibility to add to and support partners’ own approaches to implementation and advocacy. The PAOR reports are good summaries of the context in each country, and could be used in designing future interventions.

**Recognising Risk:** There are dangers involved in working in this field. Project partners found ways to deal with them. These lessons can be integrated into future work, and recognition of the risk factor should be made in project design.

**Integrated Advocacy:** *Policy engagement should be integrated into project approaches from the start, as a core part of strategy.* Engaging government is critical – at the grassroots in order to access services (which are available to some extent in all three countries), and at higher levels in order to access policymaking. A broad raft of policies relate to children and drug issues, and a child perspective is often missing.

**Capacity building:** Prioritise and carefully appraise capacity needs. In project design, consider separate outputs and indicators for capacity building of partners – NGOs, community partners, intermediaries, local or central government.

**Location:** look carefully at urban bias in site selection; consider research into drug issues in rural areas. If projects are to access national policy debate, then they may need pilot sites in more than one region or city.

**Participation:** Consider appropriate types of participation with partners and beneficiaries in designing and implementing future work, and with families and communities as well as children. This applies also to the design and process of evaluations.

**Gender, ethnicity, social issues:** See relevant general lesson.

<b>On management / administration</b>
---------------------------------------

**Longer timeframes:** Look at much longer periods of engagement for any future projects and for action programmes.

**Administration:** Aim to reduce the reporting burden for partners and IPEC staff, and streamline administrative problems. Set performance targets for IPEC project management staff to respond within a defined time period (e.g. 30 days after request) to: funding instalment requests; requests for feedback on reporting; other questions that implementing partners may have. Consider providing implementing partners with more funding prior to implementation.

**Staff exposure to project sites:** Ensure IPEC staff visit project sites at least on an occasional basis.

**Lines of responsibility** Clear lines of responsibility, and continuity, help IPEC develop good relationships with partners, and should be maintained.

**Change requirements in order to avoid obligatory mid-term evaluations** for short projects.

***Recommendations for current or future donors***

Donors can consider many of the above recommendations in the funding arrangements they may wish to set up with ILO or others working in this field.

- In particular, a stress on numbers of beneficiaries needs to be balanced with an understanding of the holistic nature and wide geographical distribution of child labour in this field. Successful action will demonstrate success through pilots, but most critically will have to engage in policy-making on the part of appropriate government agencies, not only Ministries of Labour. As with many social issues, but even more so given the illegal nature of the labour, the problem can rarely be tackled directly at source alone.
- Direct withdrawal of children from labour is very challenging in this sector. In general, prevention seems more appropriate.
- Capacity building for partners to engage in dialogue, promote change, and implement successful work is important for future success.
- It is also critical for ILO to develop good relationships with partners, and to devote time to them as well as other channels that could promote change. Reducing time currently spent on administration or reporting will support this process.
- ILO is well positioned to support work that aims to bring practical experience to the policy table in different ways. In this way, the extra overheads of a UN agency rather than an NGO can be justified and put to valuable use.

**C3: More specific lessons and recommendations for the Philippines**

**Consider adding CDT to the national TBP priority groups** – ILO staff are in favour of this, and it would encourage longer term, less restricted support.<sup>16</sup>

**Participatory community work**, where capacity exists, represents very good value for money in terms of impact. However, it is hard to replicate. There will be considerable value in continuing to fund this work, given that the project's support was so short in duration.

**Participatory design** will be important for any future support: a **network** is potentially viable, as non-governmental and governmental actors are already engaged. ILO should support the development and role of that network in future. It will be important to reach a balance between non-governmental and governmental project partners.

---

<sup>16</sup> There is a distinction between the Philippines TBP (the government programme) and the IPEC Project of Support to the Philippines TBP. IPEC Philippines is in favour of including CDT in the Philippines TBP priority groups, which will highlight its importance and hence improve possibilities of support, not only from IPEC but from other sources as well.

The Philippines has active, experienced NGOs and community-based groups. Yet the government remains critical to CDT, both through its policies and its practice. There is considerable experience of **linking between non-governmental and governmental sectors**, which the project should harness in designing future intervention.

**Capacity-building** for project partners, especially at the level of policy engagement but also as part of efforts to increase impact, should be prioritised as for most partners this is a new field.

ILO usefully provided accountancy, administrative, and media support to project partners. In future it would be ideal to **include such support within project plans**.

ILO may need to **find a key partner institution** for a follow-on project. Future work will be less research-based, and the current university partner may not wish to play such a key role in further work that is less research-based. It may be appropriate to discuss this issue with members of the formative network that appears to be emerging out of existing child labour networks and other actors as the project ends.

**Vocational training** is often mentioned as important. Involvement of older children / youth in selecting training opportunities helps ensure relevance, but vocational training is still difficult to deliver successfully. If IPEC is to support work in this field, it should ensure that partner institutions know how to diagnose and source training opportunities accurately, and use experienced providers.

**Rehabilitation** is an outstanding problem that the project has not been able to engage in. However, it is a very challenging field that may not fall under ILO's comparative advantage.

There has been little engagement on **reproductive and sexual health**, including HIV/AIDS – future interventions should encourage culturally appropriate engagement by action partners.

#### **C4: More specific lessons and recommendations for Indonesia**

**Direct work in communities is perhaps harder in Indonesia** than elsewhere, given a history of more top-down governance and less local activism. Furthermore, capacity in many fields is limited. But it is likely that drugs will be a growing issue over the next decade.

**Do not try too hard to distinguish between users and traffickers.** In future, being less specific may ease engagement with communities, local government, and provincial or national government.

**Timing of inputs** was considered a problem, with capacity building for partners, research and action all coming together.

**Relationships with partner agencies**, especially the key implementer, were damaged by staff changes and a lack of attention to the project. Future efforts will need to be more partner-friendly in terms of approach, administrative or financial assistance, participatory design, etc.

There is considerable work to be done in **finding valuable government counterparts**, and in finding an intermediary partner for future work. Potential government counterparts include sub-committees of the National Narcotics Board rather than the board itself, and the Ministry /

departments of Education. It will take time to build up connections - it should involve a process rather than a set plan, partly because laws and government structures are evolving and complex.

In the interim, **capacity-building work for NGOs** (including those already involved) such as training for social / outreach workers may help build a process of gradually increased involvement and networking. This may over time evolve to define opportunities for advocacy and find entry points into policy. The involvement of experts both in and outside government may help in designing a relevant programme. Further research to assess the situation more widely, possibly using existing data, may be a useful advocacy tool if it is devised carefully.

**Working outside as well as in Jakarta** may be necessary if the project wants to access national counterparts as part of the TBP.

**More time** is needed to develop contacts with communities, especially on such a challenging topic. It would be interesting to try to build a pilot intervention with some local government involvement, if at all possible, as an example and test case.

**Peer-to-peer approaches**, for street-based and community-based work, appear to be effective.

Partners and other local bodies have experience of **IEC** (Information, Education and Communication) **material design** that could be better harnessed.

**Referral and rehabilitation is a real issue**, especially for traffickers given that the penal system often fails to distinguish between adults and children.

#### **C5: More specific lessons and recommendations for Thailand**

**The government is already involved** through many of its agencies and departments in anti-drugs work, including work at or near the community level. This work has a mixed impact on children; there is much good work, as well as many areas where improvements could be made. It means that future IPEC involvement needs to demonstrate how modifications to policies can support the government's overall aim. This is a positive situation if entry points can be found.

The issue of **inclusion in government projects and services** is a key issue for school-based and community-based work. Many at-risk communities (urban poor, highland minority communities) fail to access support. Other support is also available in some places from the non-governmental sector: often non-governmental support is needed to build community organisation so that services can be secured. This work is much harder to replicate, however, so IPEC needs to see if there are ways of making a wider impact (through networks, through promoting policy implications, or other as appropriate.)

**The current key project partner has valuable links** with upstream policy as well as downstream community work. IPEC should aim to build its links here, but to do so will involve streamlining administrative procedures and improving financial disbursement. Partners, if willing, should also be involved in project design. This includes government ministries, e.g. education.

The project could consider whether **unregistered urban populations, chiefly migrants** from other countries (notably Myanmar), can be reached. NGOs may be able to support this.

**Support for action and policy engagement** should be channelled to Thai institutions (e.g. NCYD, NGOs, Education bodies), with IPEC maintaining a low profile in policy engagement.

There is a **supportive environment for more involvement with schools**, and more lesson-learning. This should be done in collaboration with policymakers where possible, and outputs should be defined by partners (especially in government) so that they will find them useful.

**Working in schools misses out-of-school youth.** This is an issue. Options include aiming at prevention work with younger children, accompanying school approaches with community-based work, or accepting this weakness as a cost outweighed by the benefits of widespread engagement.

Work on **building child participation** in schools or elsewhere seems valuable and appreciated by all concerned – including adults – even if it is challenging. It could be taken further through both practice and policy. Other bodies will be working in this field so their efforts should be considered in defining an approach.

More **appraisal of partners' administrative capacity**, and factoring support into any future programme, is recommended.

IPEC should consider whether it or its partners can demonstrate **the negative impact on children of some anti-drugs policy, notably the impact on children orphaned through violence** during anti-drug crackdowns since early 2003, as has occurred in project areas in Bangkok, Chiang Rai, and Chiang Mai. The unfortunate deaths of thousands of adults in drug-related conflict in Thailand has left an unspecified but large number of orphans. IPEC or partners could ensure it maintains a non-partisan and apolitical stance by promoting positive examples of project and government activities at the same time.



## **Annex One:        Terms of Reference**

### **I. Background and Justification**

The project, ‘Assessing the situation of children in the production, sales and trafficking of drugs in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand’ was started in September 2002 in reaction to the need for further research on the dangers faced by children engaged in the trafficking of drugs, one of the worst forms of child labour. The project aimed to develop and demonstrate an action-oriented research methodology that provides better understanding and information on the use of children in the production, sales, and distribution of illegal drugs.

**The development objective of the project is:** To contribute to the prevention and elimination of one of the worst forms of child labour-the use of children in the production, sales and trafficking of illegal drugs in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand.

**The immediate objectives of the project is:** At the end of the project, public institutions and stakeholders in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand will have enhanced their understanding on the targeted recruitment and use of children in the production, sale and distribution of illegal drugs.

The project through its action-oriented research aimed to reach children at risk as well as those involved in drugs through awareness-raising and youth mobilisation in communities, in schools as well as work in related environments (i.e. on the street). The project will also propose models of interventions for future replication at the end of the project. The project consisted of the following activities:

- Identification and development of regional working partnerships with regional collaborating agencies and partners including on-going projects of ILO-IPEC, UNDCP, UNESCAP
- Direct action through youth mobilization, community and families mobilization, non-formal education, counselling for families and children, referral services for families and the child victims.
- Strengthening of local networks (NGOs and community leaders, police, teachers, etc.)
- Building capacity of partners, empowerment and awareness raising at community levels and at the national level.
- Identification of models for future interventions.

As mentioned briefly above the project’s geographical coverage is the following:

Thailand: Bangkok, Rayong, Songkhla and Khonkaen Provinces

The Philippines: Tatlon, Paco-Pandacan, Pasay districts in Metro Manila

Indonesia: Jakarta

In Thailand the action research program strategy will focus on

1. School-focused in Bangkok and Songkhla
2. Community-focused in Khonkaen, Rayong and Bangkok

The direct action programme relied on existing local mechanisms (i.e. communities, schools, youth groups, NGOs) in Klong Toey district. As a result of the action-oriented research and the direct action (youth mobilization, community mobilization, NFE, counselling for families and children, referral services for families and the child victims, the whole community including families were mobilised and strengthened. Local networks (i.e. NGOs, community leaders, police, teachers, etc.) were strengthened to deal with the problem.

In the Philippines the action research was designed to generate reliable, appropriate data to support the programme formulation of a set of interventions to build the capacities of the working children (as well as their families and communities) engaged in the production, sales, and trafficking/pushing drugs. In addition to building the knowledge base on the issues, feasible interventions to tackle the issue together with a list of future research topics will be proposed at the end of the project. A key process and by-product of this action research are the capacity building initiatives and services that will also be given to service providers, mediating stakeholders, and working children with their peers and families.

In Indonesia the project aimed to develop a workable, comprehensive action programme to combat the use of children in the illicit drug trade. Therefore as in the Philippines, the project prioritised on gaining knowledge and understanding of the problem of children's involvement in drug sales/production/trafficking, and at the same time, building capacity of partners, empowerment and awareness raising at community organizations working with drug-related issues. Areas of research and models for future interventions were identified to set the stage for sustainable action beyond the proposed project duration. The project aimed to focus on three target groups in Jakarta: a poor community, a school and a community of school children.

Sub-regional level:

The programme provided sub-regional level interaction to ensure the cross-fertilization and sharing of experiences of the participating countries. The sub-regional level benefitted from the program design wherein participating countries focussed on different population sub-groups. Results of the programme will also help influence the policy and programme agencies of the cooperating regional UN and international institutions.

## **EVALUATION BACKGROUND**

The current project as per project document and ILO/IPEC evaluation procedures undertook a self-evaluation exercise in March 2004. The self-evaluation exercise was conducted via a desk review, a two-day stakeholder workshop bringing together the project management from all three countries in Bangkok and a synthesis analysis and final report. The current final evaluation will be an independent evaluation as stipulated by the project document and in agreement with stakeholders following the consultation process per procedure.

As per IPEC procedures, a participatory consultation process on the nature and specific purposes of the evaluation was carried out earlier this year. The present TOR is based on the outcome of this process.

## **II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE**

### **Scope**

The scope of the evaluation includes all project activities to date including Action Programmes. The evaluation should look at the project as a whole and address issues of project design,

implementation, lessons learned, replicability and recommendations for future programmes in general or for the TBP countries of Philippines and Indonesia specific recommendations.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the present evaluation should be to assess whether the objectives of the action research were attained, particularly in increasing the knowledge base on children in drug trafficking and in identifying/documenting effective models of intervention. The evaluation should give recommendations and lessons learned for incorporation into future planning or modification of activities or strategies for TBP countries. The evaluation should also note potential good practices that may be identified over the course of the exercise and identify replicable and sustainable models in eliminating child labour. The exercise should also attempt to identify possible areas for future IPEC support and areas for future action by communities, I.A.s and relevant authorities (without IPEC support).

## **III. SUGGESTED ASPECTS TO BE ADDRESSED**

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability as defined in the ILO Guidelines for the Preparation of Independent Evaluations of ILO Programmes and Projects and for gender concerns see: ILO Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues into the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects, January 1995. The following are the broad suggested aspects that can be identified at this point for the evaluation to address. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation consultants in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with DED. The evaluation instrument prepared by the evaluation consultant will indicate further selected specific aspects to be addressed.

### **Design**

- Assess whether the beneficiaries were clearly identified (i.e. sub-groups, age, socio-economic status, etc. 'Poor' or 'women' is not a homogenous group) determine if more details are needed to target interventions.
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analysed. Determine whether the needs, constraints, resources and access to project services of the different beneficiaries were clearly identified taking gender issues into concern.
- Examine the appropriateness of the indicators and whether they are measurable.
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent and took into account the validity and practicality of institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders
- Analyse whether adequate information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation in the three countries were taken into consideration at the time of the design and whether these were taken into consideration and reflected in the design of the project.

### **Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)**

- Examine the preparatory outputs of the delivery process in terms of timeliness and identifying the appropriate resources/persons to implement the process
- Examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality and quantity, were they delivered in a timely manner?
- Assess whether the project has achieved its objectives

- Assess to what extent the project achieved its intended outputs
- Review whether the technical and administrative guidance and support provided by project staff, partner organisations and relevant ILO units were adequate.
- Assess the participation of different relevant actors in the NSC (Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Education, trade unions, employers' organisations, etc.) How did the local management structures (National Steering Committee, Local Steering Committees) work? How did these structures participate in terms of programme implementation? How did this participation affect the outcomes of the project?
- Assess how the strategies for implementing and coordinating child labour monitoring
- Assess the effectiveness of the programme i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
- Assess whether the recommendations made in the self mid-term evaluation were acted upon and to what effect.
- Analyse the links between Action Programmes and outcomes of the project. Assess the effectiveness of the different Action Programmes implemented and their contribution to the immediate objectives of the project.
- Examine whether the capacity of community level agencies and organisations in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour?
- Assess the effectiveness of the project in building sustainable networks between organizations and government agencies working to address child labour on the national, provincial, and local levels.
- Assess the level of government commitment to and support for the project, and for future programmes aimed to eliminate the worst forms of child labour in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand.

### **Relevance of the project**

- Examine whether the project responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries
- Validity of the project approach and strategies and their potentiality to replicate
- Assess whether the problems and needs that gave rise to the project still exists or have changed
- Examine whether the external factors affecting project implementation have been adequately identified and whether the assumptions remain valid.

### **Sustainability**

- Assess to what extent a phase-out strategy and an emphasis on the sustainability of project impact, defined at the project design phase, and what steps have been taken since then to ensure project sustainability.
- Assess what contributions the project has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders, and to encourage ownership of the project to partners.
- Examine the likelihood of the partner organizations, local community including stakeholders, community leaders, local administration, local elites etc involved in the project to continue to work to eliminate and to monitor child labour after the closure of the project.
- Identify whether actions have been taken to ensure the access of girls/other vulnerable groups to services and resources.

- Examine whether the socio-cultural and gender aspects endanger the sustainability of the project and assess whether actions have been taken to sensitise local institutions and target groups on these issues.

### **Special Aspects to be Addressed**

In addition to the general concerns, the evaluation should critically explore the following issues:

- In addition to the general lessons learned and recommendations provide specific lessons and recommendations on how to integrate the lessons from the project into planning processes and implementation of future IPEC activities in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand.
- Highlight possible areas for IPEC support in this sector or in these countries

## **IV. EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF THE EVALUATION**

- ✓ An evaluation instrument prepared by the consultant
- ✓ Mission notes from field visits
- ✓ Stakeholder workshops facilitated by consultant
- ✓ Draft evaluation report including stakeholder workshop proceedings and findings from site visits by international consultant
- ✓ Final Report including:
  - Executive Summary
  - Clearly identified findings
  - Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations
  - Lessons Learned
  - Potential good practices
  - Appropriate annexes (present TOR to be annex one)

The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.

All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data, should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible in Word for Windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO/IPEC and the ILO consultants. Use of the data for publication and other presentation can only be made with the agreement of ILO/IPEC.

The final report will be circulated to key stakeholders (those participants present at stakeholder evaluation workshop will be considered key stakeholders) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Design, Evaluation and Documentation (DED) section of ILO/IPEC Geneva and provided to the consultant. In preparing the final report the consultant should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

## V. Evaluation Methodology

The following is the evaluation methodology. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by DED provided that the research and analysis suggests changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.

The evaluation team will be asked to use the standard evaluation instruments that ILO/IPEC has developed for documenting and analysing achievements of the projects and contributions of the Action Programmes to the project.

The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review, field visits to the project countries, consultations with project staff and project partners and beneficiaries and other key stakeholders and a small stakeholder workshop in each of the project countries.

### **Composition of the evaluation team:**

An international consultant will be recruited as the evaluation consultant.

The international consultant will undertake field visits to the three project sites for consultations with key stakeholders and facilitate the small stakeholder workshops and will be responsible for drafting the evaluation report. Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, the consultant will further be responsible for finalizing the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate.

The international consultant will be responsible for:

- An evaluation instrument upon initial review
- Field visits for consultations
- Programme and process for stakeholder workshop
- Draft evaluation report incorporating comments and views made during the stakeholder workshop
- Finalize and submit final evaluation report taking into account the consolidated comments of stakeholders.

The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC Design, Evaluation and Documentation section. DED will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting it to the international consultant.

The ideal candidate for the evaluation team members will have:

- Proven extensive evaluation exercise
- Broad knowledge of and insight in development issues in the region
- Technical knowledge of child labour
- Excellent report writing skills
- Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings

### **Timetable and Workshop:**

The total duration of the evaluation process including submission of the final report should be within two months from the end of the field mission.

The international consultant will be engaged for six workweeks of which three weeks will be field visits in Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines. The tentative timetable is as follows (exact dates to be determined upon consultation)

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks
I	International Consultant	➤ Desk review of project related documents
II	Intl Consultant with project support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Field visits to Philippines, Indonesia and Thailand</li> <li>➤ Consultations with project staff in each country</li> <li>➤ Consultations with project partners (implementing agencies), beneficiaries and other key stakeholders in each country</li> <li>➤ Workshop with key stakeholders in each country</li> </ul>
III	International Consultant	➤ Draft Report based on consultations from field visits and desk review
IV	DED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Circulate draft report to key stakeholders</li> <li>➤ Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to consultant</li> </ul>
V	International Consultant	➤ Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included

### Schedule and Duration

Phase	Duration	Dates
I	5 work days	Tentative dates September 20-24
II	15 work days	PHI: September 27-October 1 INS: October 4-8 THA: October 11-15
III	5 work days	October 18-22
IV	Two work weeks	October 25-November 5
V	5 work days	November 17

### **Sources of Information and Consultations/meetings**

- Project document
- Progress reports
- Technical and financial reports of partner organizations (Action Programmes)
- Studies if appropriate
- Self-evaluations of any Action Programmes if available
- Action Programme Summary Outlines
- Project files
- Self mid-term evaluation report
- National workshop proceedings or summaries

### **Consultations and Meetings:**

#### **Project Management:**

Taneeya Runcharoen (Thailand)

Pandji Putranto (Indonesia)

Concepcion Sardana (Philippines)

Panudda Boonpala (Bangkok)

Patrick Quinn (TBP Indonesia)

Serenidad Lavador (TBP Philippines)

#### **Partner Agencies**

To be filled out by project management

#### **Government Officials**

To be filled out by project management

#### **Trade Unions**

To be filled out by project management

#### **Employers Organizations**

Beneficiaries girls and boys

Women and men

#### **Final Report Submission**

For independent evaluations, the following procedure is used:

- The evaluation team will submit a draft report to IPEC DED in Geneva
- IPEC DED will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarifications
- IPEC DED will consolidated the comments and send these to the internal evaluator by date agreed between DED and evaluator as soon as comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to IPEC DED who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including donor, within two months of the completion of fieldwork.



### **Annex Three:     List of written / electronic information sources**

- Project document
- Action programme agreement documents
- Initial assessments on the use of children in drug trafficking in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand
- Project / action programme Technical Progress Reports and Status reports
- Project / action programme Financial reports
- Progress reports
- Project files
- Self mid-term evaluation report
- Proceedings of national stakeholders consultation workshops, including presentations
- Partner promotional and information material
- Participatory Action-Oriented Research reports for each country, and overall summary report
- Sub-regional output intervention models report
- Workshop and meeting presentations by partner agencies
- Gender Observation in the Site Visits Regarding the ILO-IPEC Action Programme on Children in Drugs by Yeon Me Kim, ILO Philippines
- ILO IPEC documents of support to the Time Bound Programme in the Philippines and in Indonesia.
- Background reading including IPEC DED guidelines, information from the ILO website and other websites. A range of background material on children and drug issues.
- Background information on development in Thailand, Indonesia, Philippines from a range of sources: UNDP and World Bank websites, etc.